

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 5w

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/339,869	06/25/1999	JUN KOIDE	35.C13613	. 3159
5514 75	590 , 12/17/2004	· ·	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			TUGBANG, ANTHONY D	
30 ROCKEFEL NEW YORK, 1			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE 3729	
1,2,,,,				

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/339,869	KOIDE ET AL.				
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit				
	A. Dexter Tugbang	3729				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	**			
THE REPLY FILED 27 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);					
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Attachment</u> .						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were nev	vly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			n			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:		,				
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5-15,32</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
		A. Dexter Tugbang Primary Examiner At Unit 2720				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Application/Control Number: 09/339,869

Art Unit: 3729

Attachment to Advisory Action

After having carefully reviewed the proposed After Final amendment filed on 10/27/04, the amendment raises new issues requiring further consideration for the following reasons.

In Claim 1, the new limitations of "one or more" (line 5), as this refers to the number of openings of the mask plate in the alternative, raises new issues because the mask can now have one, single opening along with the discharge port plate having only one, single discharge port with the alternative limitation of "one or more discharge ports" (line 6). The alternative limitations above completely change the scope of the step of "closely contacting...side" (lines 5-7) and this requires further consideration by the examiner.

With respect to the discharge port having "an area that increases" (lines 14-15) in a direction away from a source of the beams, these newly proposed limitations require further consideration by the examiner to the extent that this feature appears to be taught by the prior art. European Patent Publication, EP 0 309 146, referred to hereinafter as EP'146, appears to be forming discharge ports 13 by simultaneously irradiating plural beams through a mask plate 12 so that an area of the ports 13 increases in a direction away from the source of the beams 10 (see Figs. 1 and 2).

Each of Claims 6 and 32 have been proposed to be amended with similar limitations as in Claim 1 and thus, new issues requiring further consideration are raised for the very same reasons above with Claim 1.